



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/720,710	06/01/2001	Vanessa Z.H. Chan	M0925/7067	5662
7590 08/02/2007				
Timothy J Oyer Wolf Greenfield & Sacks Federal Reserve Plaza 600 Atlantic Avenue Boston, MA 02210-2211			EXAMINER CHANG, VICTOR S	
			ART UNIT 1771	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/02/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

09/720,710

**Applicant(s)**

CHAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Victor S. Chang

**Art Unit**

1771

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Victor S. Chang.(3) Edwin Thomas.(2) Timothy Over.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 30 July 2007.Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yese) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: all active.Identification of prior art discussed: prior art of record.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants inquire how the examiner interpret the term "topologically continuous" in the claims, and point out the definition at pages 13-14, bridging sentence. Applicants argue that the instant invention differs from the prior art in its topologically continuous feature. The examiner agrees to reconsider, based on the definition in the specification, applicants' argument and evidence to show that prior art and the instant invention are structurally distinct.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Victor S Chang/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1771

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required